(Court in Session at 10:15 a.m.)

(Off Record Talking)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is the case of the United States of America vs. Charles Koss. The number is 12-133-01-CR-W-HFS. have the lawyers here representing the United States and we have the defendant in front of me, along with standby counsel. is a continuation of a hearing that we recessed last week, that caused me to rescheduled it on the account that the defendant did not have a copy of the report that had been generated by the Bureau of Prisons. We made sure that he had a copy of that report from several different sources. In addition, I issued an order after that hearing about the nature of the events that took place there and advising everyone about what may happen here if we have a continued problem proceeding with the processing of this case. So, and that order has been provided to everyone, including the defendant in several ways. With regard to the representation issue, it's always been my practice when we ever have a question of competency, to assume that that's an issue and to not allow a defendant to represent himself or herself during those proceedings, but because that seems to be a trigger for the defendant in this case, I've decided to allow him to represent himself even at this stage rather than relying on standby I'm hopeful that that might diffuse some of the problems that we had in the past. I would note that the report that I've been given indicates that he is competent, so I think

it's not an area in which I have concerns about the ultimate conclusion here. So, I'm hopeful that perhaps that might help us process this case. I have the report which, as I mentioned, has been provided to everyone, including the defendant, and I'm going to judicially notice that as a court record here. It's also a public document, so it will be included as part of the evidence on this issue. With regard to the issue of competency, does the United States have any additional evidence?

MR. ALFORD: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: With regard to the competency issue, does the defense have any evidence that they want to present?

MR. KOSS: It would only be personal evidence, Your Honor. In the report that you're looking at --

THE COURT: Would you the microphone so I can hear you all right? Go ahead.

MR. KOSS: Okay. Can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm fine now.

MR. KOSS: Okay. In the report that I'm looking at, it -- excuse me just a second.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. KOSS: In the report that I'm looking at, the -- it indicates in the report that the prosecutor -- or excuse me. I have medical issues.

THE COURT: Why don't you sit down and relax for a second. Sit down --

MR. KOSS: It would be better if I stand up.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KOSS: It's when I'm sitting down.

THE COURT: Whatever is more comfortable for you. Go ahead.

MR. KOSS: In the report the doctor stated that my parents molested me sexually and physically and things -- and, sir, as God is my witness and I love my parents and they're both deceased, but that never happened and it was never stated and never said. And I was going to have something here to present to you but I couldn't get it notarized, so, --

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. KOSS: -- I'm telling you that there's some parts of the report that, as I've looked at, had myself, you know, a living, breathing man, that this did not happen.

THE COURT: Well, let's do this. If there's parts of the report that you want to make a proffer about, you object to, I'll give you an opportunity to do that. Now, this is one area where it's referenced in there, alleged that there were some statements made about abuse. I will accept your proffer on that without anything else. That will be part of the record here.

Okay?

MR. KOSS: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Now is there anything else in the report that you think is inaccurate or erroneous here that

you want to bring to my attention, other than that piece?

MR. KOSS: There are several pieces in there, sir, --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KOSS: -- that I don't agree with and it just appears that I didn't have a chance to look at it because I really need to talk about other things here. They go back way to May 7th. And I think it's critical to this case that you get the arrest warrant in front of you and look at it because there are issues with it that are wrong.

THE COURT: Right. We're just dealing though with this report. Is there anything else in the report that you feel uncomfortable about, because now is the time to raise those with it?

MR. KOSS: I have brothers. It says I have none. There are issues in that I don't know exactly what all of them are at the current time.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KOSS: But there are issues that I had brought up and in my own mind that are inaccurate and --

THE COURT: DO you want me to give you some more time to look at the report so you can detail for me at another --

MR. KOSS: I intended to have it to where I could put it in an affidavit form, but I couldn't get it notarized where I'm at.

THE COURT: You don't need to put it in affidavit form.

If you would just -- if you want, you can just prepare a list of items and you can read it into the record, and if you would, if you would go to the report and indicate the page that you're concerned about, then we'll go ahead and go through it and I'll let you make a record on that.

MR. KOSS: I understand that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KOSS: But, sir, I need to get back to the affidavit because it --

THE COURT: Can we just -- can you just --

MR. KOSS: -- to the arrest warrant.

THE COURT: Can you just let me finish this piece and then I'll let you -- I'll deal with the other issue in a moment here.

MR. KOSS: Sir, I'm challenging your jurisdiction and once that's been challenged, you cannot move another step to gain anything in the way that would be jurisdiction. I'm questioning the arrest warrant.

THE COURT: I've heard this all before and, again, here's the problem that we're going to run into, Mr. Koss. And I don't want this to happen.

MR. KOSS: I'm not Mr. Koss.

THE COURT: Okay. The representative then. Okay?

MR. KOSS: You can call me Chuck.

THE COURT: Chuck, okay. Here's the problem that we're

going to run into and this is something that I want to avoid, frankly. You have a right to represent yourself, but you have to follow the procedures that we employ here. And if you don't do that, and you become disruptive, which I hope that won't happen, then what will happen is I'm going to have to take some steps to make sure that I'm able to process this case. And I don't want that to happen here. What I need you to do is to focus on this report. I want to give you an opportunity to go through it. And if you have problems with it, I'll give you an opportunity to make a record on it. But that's why we're here. I'm not going to deal with warrants and other things. I'm here to deal with this issue today. Now, if you want me to give you some time to prepare to do that, I will give you that time. But I'm not going to talk about warrants today. Okay?

MR. KOSS: Well, Judge, I put in for an identity hearing, a notice and demand for an identity hearing. And when I put that in, I think it was -- I don't know when it was docketed, but it was early in October. It was sometime in the last week of September that I put that in. And the main reason I put in for that identity hearing was because the arrest warrant is not properly in front of you. I'm just questioning if you don't have the proper person in front of you right now, then all this other things that -- the everything is fruits of the poisonous tree.

THE COURT: And I'm telling you, we're going to deal with this report and that's what we're going to talk about. Now,

if you want me to give you more time to prepare for this, I will do that. I will continue this another day and we will have you come back in and you can give your list of objections or concerns that you have about this report. Do you want me to do that?

MR. KOSS: Sir, I don't -- I don't believe any more time is going to do any good for anybody. What I'm trying to tell you is if you've got the wrong person in front of you, then, sir, it would only make sense that you would have an identity hearing because you don't know who's sitting in front of you. The number is on the arrest warrant is not identifying the property. Now, shouldn't it identify the property? I mean, you're an arbitrator. I understand your --

THE COURT: No, I'm not. I'm a judge.

MR. KOSS: Well, you're a judge.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KOSS: And your position is to stay neutral. And that much I know for a fact. And, sir, in front of me I have the property that doesn't belong in front of this Court, the person, then you have the wrong person that's been arrested.

(Off Record Whispering)

MR. KOSS: And I do not have legal counsel here and this man has no business speaking with me.

THE COURT: I think, you know, I've said that you can represent yourself at this point because I was trying to avoid the problems that emerged from the last hearing where it just

became out of control. And, so, you need to understand, though, that I will let you represent yourself to the extent you are willing to comply with what I think the procedures are. And those are today, we're going to deal with this competency issue. We're not going to talk about any other issue. So, if you want me to give you time, this is the third time I'm asking you. Do you want me to give you more time to review the report to make any objections to it? Do you want that or not? If you don't want that, then we go down a different path. If you do, I will give you time to do that.

MR. KOSS: Sir, I'm just saying that I'm challenging the jurisdiction of this Court because I don't believe you have the right person in front of you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I am going to then assume that the record is complete and we will get a Report and Recommendation out to Judge Sachs on this recommending to Judge Sachs that the -- Chuck be found to be legally competent to proceed to trial. I think that's everything I'm going to cover today on behalf of the United States?

MR. ALFORD: Well, Your Honor, I have concerns that as we prepare for trial, even though, you know, the defendant's mentally competent, that I have a hard time believing we'll be able to get through a trial without the defendant trying to hijack the judicial process. And what my -- the biggest concern the United States would have, and it's even in the defendant's

best interest, is that if we had a mistrial, it wastes a lot of time and resources. I know it's unusual to have standby counsel prepare for a defense, but I think at this point it might make sense to at least have him start beginning to go through the discovery. There's extensive discovery in the case, and in the event the District Court Judge who tries the case feels that the defendant is being obstructive and is hijacking the judicial process, at least we won't have a mistrial. We'll be able to continue on with the trial with Mr. Kuchar representing the defendant.

THE COURT: No, I -- (Clearing throat). Excuse me.

Here's the deal. At this point, it's been tentatively decided by me that the defendant is competent to proceed. We have to await for Judge Sachs to enter a final ruling on that. Assuming Judge Sachs does find him to be competent, which I'm confident that that's what the outcome will be here, then Mr. Koss, just as any other person, has a constitutional right to represent himself.

We have gone through that hearing and we've made a record on it and we've found him to be -- if Judge Sachs finds him to be competent, then he will be allowed to represent himself.

However, that does not mean that the court is required to just let him do anything in a courtroom. And so I have directed, as my order reflects, that we have standby counsel available, not to be involved in the litigation, but simply to be available if, at some point we have to have Mr. Koss removed. I'm hopeful that

that will not occur. I'm hopeful that Mr. Koss, who I think is sincere in his beliefs, will show the necessary respect to the court and to the procedures that we have to follow.

MR. KOSS: There is no title. There is --

THE COURT: On the other hand --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KOSS: Sir, I object. There was no title for the defendant. The defendant is the defendant. Mr. Koss isn't in the courtroom.

So, so long as Chuck does Okay. Fine. THE COURT: comply with those basic requirements of showing respect to the court and to follow the court's directive on rulings, then he will be allowed to continue to represent himself. And if that doesn't happen, the order has set in place for every hearing, whether it's in front of me or Judge Sachs or any trial, that there will be a video feed for us to have the defendant watch the proceedings, and at that point, if we're confronted with a situation that we have no other choice but to have standby counsel move in, we will do that. And the Eighth Circuit has, as I outlined in my order, the Eighth Circuit has said, you know, that that's fine. But here's the deal, I don't want to go down -- this is a significant constitutional right that he has and he's entitled to represent himself. And we're not going to assume that he's going to fail to comply with reasonable procedures that the court needs to impose upon him. And so long as he does accede to those and comply with them, then we'll all

be fine. And I'm not going to worry about what might happen down the road. So, unless there's -- I mean, I recognize that he's not taken advantage of the open-file discovery here. Is that what your concern is?

MR. ALFORD: Well, many concerns, Your Honor. I mean -THE COURT: Well, let's just deal with that one. Will
you answer that question? Has he availed himself of that
disclosure?

MR. ALFORD: The last time I check with the Marshal's Service he's never reviewed any of the discovery that we've provided.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that's his choice. We've got it in place in the Marshal's lockup. He's been told that he only has to ask for permission to come here and to look at it and if he chooses not to, then that's his choice to do that. I'm not -- you know, he's been found to be competent and he's allowed to represent himself, so I don't see how I can get involved in that now. Is there some other thing that you want me --

MR. ALFORD: My main concern is, Your Honor, you know, at numerous hearings, as Your Honor is fully aware, the defendant, you know, interrupts the judge, interrupts myself. The United States has a right to present its case. And my concern is is that the defendant at trial, after we've invested additional resources getting witnesses, everything that goes along with a trial, the defendant will not allow the United

States to present its case, which we have a right to do. And at that time, --

THE COURT: I understand your right. What are you asking me to do?

MR. ALFORD: I'm asking that Mr. Kuchar begin reading the discovery so that he could actually be appointed in the event that that occurs, so that he's ready to go.

MR. KOSS: I object.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Kuchar?

MR. KOSS: I object to -- there is no other counsel here. I am the only one that is the secured party to the estate and there is no one here that represents the Koss estate.

THE COURT: And I've told you that you can represent yourself.

MR. KOSS: I represent myself.

THE COURT: I've told you that. Now, let me just hear from Mr. Kuchar for a moment, okay? I just want to get his response to this.

MR. KOSS: Well, Judge --

THE COURT: So, just relax. Yes?

MR. KUCHAR: You know, I had a -- I should say a brief, although somewhat meaningful conversation, I think, with Mr. Koss, I think -- this morning, and I think some of his demeanor is a little better than it was probably last time. And that's my observation anyway. And what I tried to --

THE COURT: It's mine as well.

MR. KUCHAR: Yeah. And when I tried to stress, without, you know, getting into -- I guess, of course, there's an attorney-client privilege in place, is he needs to -- my words are be cool and stay calm and follow the procedures of it. And he's about to interrupt me, I'm afraid, but so far he's been doing pretty well. Now, our office's position, of course, is unless and until something were to occur where we were appointed officially as his attorney, we can't be involved in the representation other than standby, so we can't review discovery, we can't file motions, we can't work on jury instructions, we can't do voir dire, because Mr. Koss has made it pretty clear that he doesn't want us to do that. And very clear, abundantly clear.

MR. KOSS: There is no Mr. Koss here.

MR. KUCHAR: I'm sorry. Chuck.

THE COURT: Chuck.

MR. KUCHAR: And anyway, that's -- I've talked to Ray about that and that's kind of where we're at on it. It's not like we -- look, it would be easier for everybody at this point, in my opinion, and I told Mr. Koss this, if he were to ask us to represent him, he, right now, and it seems like he really -- Chuck, I beg your pardon -- doesn't want that and so we can't be kind of partially in it and partially out. I guess that's kind of our position on it.

THE COURT: That's been this Court's long-term position that we're not going to have hybrid representation. If a defendant wants to represent himself, he or she is able to do that. So, I'm not going to direct that the Federal Public Defender prepare kind of a shadow defense here. If Mr. Koss behaves himself and is respectful to the court and follows the court's --

MR. KOSS: Sir, there is no Mr. Koss.

THE COURT: Excuse me, Chuck. If Chuck acts appropriately in court and follows our directives, then you know, we won't have any problems. So, I'm not anticipating that. The case will not be tried by Judge Sachs. We'll get another judge to try it, but I will make sure that we have in place available the feed if we run into problems and if we need to take that step, then we'll deal with that when it happens. But I'm hopeful that Chuck will continue to behave the way he's been behaving today and we won't have any instances of outbursts, so. Okay? All right. Now, anything else that the government wants to raise?

MR. ALFORD: Nothing specifically today. But just to remind the Court, the United States filed a motion back in June to hold the defendant in civil contempt, and I know we need to wait for Judge Sachs to make a ruling on the competency issue. But I'm just advising the Court that, in anticipation of Judge Sachs' determining that the defendant is competent, we'd just

like to remind the Court we have that motion pending.

THE COURT: I'm fully aware of it. It has to do with the fact that he refused to provide you with, I believe it was handwriting.

MR. ALFORD: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so, -- and you know, and, so we'll deal with that issue once we get this issue resolved, so.

MR. ALFORD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You're trying to put the cart in front of the horse here. So, okay? All right. Well, thank you.

MR. KOSS: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KOSS: Before you adjourn.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KOSS: The defendant should have one last -- and I object to adjourning because the arrest warrant that's in front of me is 8024, the last for digits. That does not match the property of 4096, which is the Koss estate. And I'm trying to figure out how you could justify signing the process, which I assumed that you signed it.

THE COURT: I don't know what it is you're referring to.

Is it the --

MR. KOSS: The arrest warrant.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KOSS: So, I'm just trying to decide how 8024 is

supposed to be here today, is instead it's a 4096. That is my identity question.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't know what to say in response to that. All I know is you were arrested on a warrant and --

MR. KOSS: But it didn't -- but the warrant isn't to me, sir. That's my point.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. KOSS: And I'm not trying to be disruptive at all. And I'll give you all the respect in the world. It's my intention to try to my best to get along, but this warrant, the number one identifier that everyone has, everyone could be an a/k/a. There's only 365 birth dates, you can live anywhere. But the number one identifier that the United States associates with its people, its public, is the Social Security, and in this incidence, the Social Security that's on the arrest warrant does not match the property of the person that you've arrested.

THE COURT: Uh-huh. I've heard this before and again, it's not an argument that I find to be persuasive, and so, if that's a motion, it's overruled.

MR. KOSS: Well, sir, how can you overrule when you don't have the right party in front of you? I mean, how is that possible?

THE COURT: I know. We keep on rotating around to that same argument and, Chuck, it's not particularly persuasive to me. It's not persuasive to any other court above me, and there are

lots of them above me. So, that -- to the extent that's a motion, I'm denying the motion and we're going to proceed processing this case. All right. Thank you. (Court Adjourned at 10:39 a.m.)

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceeding in the above-entitled matter.

<u>/s/ Lissa C. Whittaker</u> Signature of transcriber

November 8, 2012
Date